

United States District Court
Central District of California

ARSLAN BHATTI,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROGER GOLDMAN; TELECOM DEBT
COLLECTION AND CREDIT
INFORMATION AGENCY; BANKAI
GROUP, INC.; BANKIM
BRAHMBHATT; DOES 1–10, inclusive,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-03226-ODW(RZx)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
EX PARTE MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO TAKE LIMITED DISCOVERY
[63]**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Arslan Bhatti’s Ex Parte Motion for Leave to Take Limited Discovery. (ECF No. 63.) Bhatti seeks leave to conduct “limited discovery” on non-parties in order to identify Doe Defendants. The named Defendants do not oppose Bhatti’s request. (See ECF No. 64.) But the Court finds Bhatti’s request inappropriate for ex parte relief.


To justify *ex parte* relief, the moving party must demonstrate that it (1) will be irreparably harmed if *ex parte* relief is not granted and (2) was without fault in creating the crisis requiring *ex parte* relief. *Mission Power Eng’g Co. v. Continental*

1 *Cas. Co.*, 883 F. Supp. 488, 492 (C.D. Cal. 1995). Furthermore, this Court strongly
2 discourages *ex parte* practice.

3 Here, Bhatti fails to articulate a justification for *ex parte* relief. Bhatti has not
4 explained why the Motion must be heard on an *ex parte* basis with shortened notice.
5 Accordingly, Bhatti's *Ex Parte* Motion for Leave to Take Limited Discovery is
6 **DENIED.** (ECF No. 63.)

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 October 17, 2014

10
11 

12 **OTIS D. WRIGHT, II**
13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28